

Feb 22, 1967

Dear Ray, yes, I was really interested in the portion of your chapter and since I have given up my hyperactive sleep³ find time to write you a letter. I might even dig up the 1000 pages from the cabinet where I once wrote about the "tentative fall of the role of profit" and the "organic composition of capital" under state capitalism.

It became a fashion to fête Marx as a "great philosopher" and even as a "humanist". All this is nice and good, but one forgets that he spent 25 years on the Capital. Very consciously he left philosophy to give the genuine critics of the ^{hat} ~~nick~~ (with Engels) closed for ever "philosophy" after they had put Hegel on its feet.

Try to understand me. I am not against Lenin's discovery of Hegel. He might have had good reasons for it, after himself blundering around with formalist materialism. That he ^{the} mastered Hegel as Marx

I have no doubt - he could not have written State and Revolution without it. But what do you really mean Hegel for? You cannot surprise me in the recognition of Hegel's importance, but still, what do we need him for? Don't we have confusion enough? I am afraid that for example to serious revolutionaries in Japan Hegel can very much appeal ^{voice} ~~voice~~ as to Hengstenberg or to some good fellows

12517 with strong arms or to intellectuals who like

Handwritten note in left margin: "I don't know if Marx only thought... 1912... Long also said Kautsky"

Geist
~~spirit~~ I prefer them that they should stick to Buddhism!

There, there cannot be today philosophy without
Hegel. ^{Why do we use philosophy? we have} But socialists went further. ~~He was the one~~

~~already said~~ Why do we have to get back
to the time before Heinrich Heine who said
everything what had to be said about Hegel and

Bertram: Philosophy as Reciprocity? There is nothing
which gives us ~~no~~ ^{no} ~~useful~~ ^{useful} intellectual

enjoyment ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~as~~ ^{as} Hegel and all
of them who directly read Hegel, i. e. Herder

etc. But only Marx is concrete. In fact, Hegel
became Hegel through Marx. In fact, Hegel without

Spinoza or Herder would not have been - but
Marx could have been completely without

Hegel. What he ^{not Hegel, but what Hegel also used!} really ~~was~~ ^{was} the English
& French Revolutions, the concrete ~~struggle~~ ^{class struggle,}

I will write or write about it. The main
question is: what ^{can} you ~~cannot~~ say with Marx

without Hegel. There is nothing! But on

the other side is a danger involved, a
danger of confusion. But isn't there enough

confusion? Do you really think that Rosa L.
did not understand the sch. ~~because~~ ^{because} she

knew Hegel's language? How simple would
this be. Sure it is the Hegel ~~dialectic~~ ^{dialectic} when Marx

Luciano did change language & the difference with
the Hegel a whole perspective of reality & such, it is very
good to fall in the course of the work - as he has not done

- 4 -

taught Spinoza as Hegel to the Chicago Students
in Moscow 1924-27. He always told me that
they were the best students he ever had. I used
to make him mad when I quote Hegel against him.

Now, Ray, I gave you also the "concrete" lead
with which to criticize my critique of your
Hegel apologetic - I leave it to you, everybody
has a right to misunderstand everybody - I
am not against Hegel, but I see a danger in
the re-discovery of Hegel, I see more confusion.

Therefore, since I am not religious, I dare
say that to me personally is Hegel nothing
more than HECUBA!

I am not against theory, I am for it very
much, but one should really be concrete. The
Johnson "Great Society" or "Wirtschaftswunder"
is an excellent material for the organic composition
of capital, why not spend the time and
energy for such a book which could even
be read? - one concrete step which would
to say be more than 10 programmes,
if I may paraphrase Marx:

Believe me, I mean it!

Poor.

Yours

P.S. By the way, ~~speaking~~ about Hegel.

12520